DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 629 FL 008 621

AUTHOR Casmir, Fred L.
TITLE A Multicultural Perspective of Human Communication.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the annual convention of the Communication Association of the Pacific (Kobe, Japan, June 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Communication Problems; Cross Cultural Studies; Cultural Pluralism; *Culture; Intergroup Relations; *Language; *Sociolinguistics; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Intercultural Communication

ABSTRACT

This paper views communication as the major human survival tool. Any approach which limits or hampers the innate metabolic human ability to adapt, in order to maximize the chances for survival through communication, is thus seen as dangerous. Instead, a methodology is suggested to develop a communication sub-culture, to facilitate individual contributions and adaptations, rather than the use of methodologies, organizations or systems based on fitting participants into preconceived structures. Development of a matrix for interaction thus becomes a result of maximized individual development and adaptation rather than a result of submerging the individual into some definitional group, system, or organization. This basic principle is specifically applied to the area of international and intercultural communication.
(Author/CFM)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED140629

# A Multicultural Perspective of Human Communication

FRED L. CASMIR

Defining human beings as open, biological, metabolic systems, this paper views communication as the major human survival tool. Any approach which limits or hampers the innate metabolic human ability to adapt in order to maximize the chances for survival through communication, is thus seen as dangerous. Suggested instead is a methodology to develop situationally a communication sub-culture, to facilitate individual contributions and adaptations, rather than the use of methodologies, organizations or systems, based on fitting participants into preconceived structures. Development of a matrix for interaction thus becomes a result of maximized individual development and adaptation rather than submerging the individual into some definitional group, system, or organization. This basic principle is specifically applied to the area of international and intercultural communication.

Because a variety of difficulties are commonly presumed to result when representatives of different cultures or nations interact, a study of these areas of human interaction may provide more readily accepted insights which can also be related to all human communication. Some of my basic assumptions underlying the specific factors discussed in this paper are:

> Communication is the basic survival mechanism of human beings, both internally and externally. Without the ability to communicate we lose, on the biological-metabolic level, our very lives, and on the cultural, social, symbolic, interpersonal, and aesthetic levels we lose our distinctly human features, although we may continue to survive biologically.
>
> Communication is thus seen not merely as a cultural or social attribute of human beings but as our most basic mechanism or tool for existence.

FL008621



U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

> Communication is signficantly identified with the receiver. That is, so called reality in all instances is a matter of interpretation. Communication can be viewed on one level as purposive, that is directed towards someone or something with a specific purpose in mind. It can also be considered, on another level, as a constant internal and external process, based on the evaluation of anything the human organism perceives, interprets, and interrelates, whether that be another organism, an object, or an event. A combination of both these approaches is fundamental to the study of human communication.
>
> It is this author's contention (as also argued in another context) that human communication should be considered on two levels. One relates to the observation and interpretation of the purposeful, fluidly constructed systems in our environment, devised to meet situationally specific communicative needs. The second, deeper level, relates to the biologic-metabolic creative, generative mechanisms or codes within us which result in the discovery and use of basic communication rules. These rules then are interpreted situationally, culturally, and socially in an infinite variety of ways and result in the identification and use of systems. Our methodologies and studies can suffer if the vital differences between these two levels are not adequately considered.[1]

In attempting to determine generally applicable communication norms students of human communication in the past have heavily relied upon methodologies which were devised for the discovery of natural laws, and which

therefore, primarily relied upon the approaches used by the natural sciences. Against the background of a changing emphasis and the development of a pluralistic approach to methodologies in the social sciences, this paper takes also into consideration a variety of other bases, which have been carefully outlined by Monge and Cushman.[2]

Monge indicates that the approach of the behaviorists, basing their work on a laws-perspective and strict causal-relations, is challenged today by the views of the anti-Positivists, idealists, or teleologically-oriented students who in their finalist approaches use more than the patterns required by the natural sciences in their attempts to rationally interpret reality.[3] Monge also argues that in the past students of human communication have, in their insistence on purposive, pro-active, and choice-oriented theories actually worked much more consistently within a teleogical framework. At the same time they have often claimed, probably because of the assumed inherent values of the natural-sciences-approach, that their work has been basically behavioral.[4]

For the purpose of this paper two basic approaches have been combined: Human communication is interactional, generative, creative, it is the product of generative mechanisms, as outlined by Madden and others in their studies on causality.[5] Commonly described regularities in human communicative interaction, however, are not the result of factors in the natural order of things, but they are the result of systems constructed by human beings to demonstrate the results of such underlying codes and rules in specific situations. Usually, they do not sufficiently take into account the possibility of deep-structures, or innate codes in human beings similar to or equivalent to biological codes.

Useful in describing many human interactions is some sort of a structure, or system of interrelations within an environment, which can be identified or defined.[6] Systems should not be perceived as being a part of the

natural order of things but rather as created structures which are fluid and situationally identifiable.[7] Cushman sees the main component parts in the identification and study of systems as: a set of objects or events; a set of relationships; and a calculus or operation for manipulating or drawing conclusions from the systems as we attempt to make our findings about specific systems more generally applicable.[8] Systems-theorists, generally agree that these are overlaid models, not actual discoveries of natural systems. Thus it becomes evident that the general-systems-approach does little to identify what causes the development of systems or the underlying rules which may determine their coming into existence. Maslowe defines systems as ". . .a unique whole of interacting and interdependent parts, containing people and things, whose effectiveness is the degree to which planned-for goals are achieved within the environment."[9] Schein adds some important dimensions when he sees a system as something which imports elements from the environment, converts them, and exports them back to the environment. This is basically the description of an open system, such as metabolic systems represented by human beings.[10] Elsewhere, I have indicated my own stipulation, that the basic human (physiologically-and neurologically-based) survival mechanism underlying all rules of human communicative behavior is probably a metabolic, interactional function which seeks through constant interaction, internally and externally, to preserve a basic, individual equilibrium by means of a variety of communicative processes.[11] Change, according to Schein, comes about through perceived inconsistencies, or the perception of an imbalance.

A concern with rules as one aspect of underlying factors in human behavior has been recently developed, as another means of gaining a more complete understanding of human communication.[12] Strictly causal-connections under this perspective are no longer thought to be sufficient, rather,

teleological approaches requiring consideration both of the intentional level and past experience, as well as the surface or outward activities resulting from these underlying factors, are considered to be more adequate. With Cushman, I would accept the necessity of consensually shared, GENERATIVE rules underlying observable instances or systems His four propositions appear to be an excellent starting point for the factors relating to intercultural communication later on considered in this paper:

1. That conjoint, combined and associated action is characteristic of human behavior.
2. That the transfer of symbolic information facilitates conjoint, combined and associated behavior.
3. That the transfer of symbolic information requires the interaction of sources, messages, and receivers guided and governed by communication rules.
4. That communication rules form general and specific patterns which provide the ground for a fruitful explanation and description of particular communicative transaction.[13]

A pluralistic methodology is suggested which does not confuse the systems-level or rules-level with the discovery of anything which may lead to identification of factors which are apart of any inherent, innate, or creative-generative mechanism in human beings on the level of the natural order of things. To put it in Koestler's words, we should not confuse the matrix and the code.[14]

The basic concern of this paper is that we develop thought-models which consciously allow for the development of situations in which codes (and not merely preconceived systems) can become active, generative forces, PRIOR

to any attempt to create a formal system or systems of human interaction based on rule identification. The model I have in mind resembles one provided for us in neurological development (since I believe that the eventual theory, or model of human communication which we will find most adequate, will be biologically-neurologically oriented), "progressive individualism within a totally integrated matrix, and not progressive integration of primarily individuated units." [15] This explanation for the growth of motor neurons as they prepare for later contacts with not yet existing muscles, may serve as a model for human interaction. Such a communication matrix, eventually defined or discovered by interacting human beings, can encourage meaningful and highly productive, creative, progressive individualism through "metabolic" adaptation. Any attempt at merely integrating individual units into some sort of culturally, functionally, sociologically or otherwise pre-determined system, on the other hand, can lead to breakdowns or the insufficient use of the available creative-generative aspects of human interaction at the "code-level."

Marlowe makes clear that in human interaction all partners want to maximize their personal benefits, but they are also willing to develop and accept rules to "stabilize the social order" in order to get at least something out of the interaction.[16] It is at this level that human communication provides the mechanisms, or tools, for working out both individual and group (or cultural and social) needs. I agree with those social scientists who state that our survival depends on interaction with others, as well as adequate interaction within our individual, internal physiological-neurological systems. Mutual influence may make us both human, and <u>effective</u> human beings.[17] Without such interaction both individuals and societies would eventually collapse because our most important survival ability, our adaptive, creative-interactional communication would be severely disturbed. As Marlowe points out, "Affiliation is a means of survival. Affiliation means a close connection and relationships, and it implies a desire for such an association to exist. . ." [18]

Our judgments and perceptions are modified by interaction with others. Indeed our motives change, based on the adaptive-interactional rules of human behavior stipulated to underlie our communicative interactions.

Dissonance-theories, balance-theories, and others have fairly consistently described what happens when our dynamic state of equilibrium is challenged or disturbed, but they have not adequately addressed themselves to the underlying codes or mechanisms which bring about feelings of imbalance.[19] All seem to agree on the necessity for mutually supporting cognitions, emotions and actions, however. Within cultures and societies, over time, agreements are "worked out." In most intercultural or international communication situations however, because of time pressures a "compromise-model" is usually introduced which attempts to arbitrarily combine what some leaders judge to be the most acceptable component parts of all involved views. At other times, the dominant power of one or more of the participants may be used to force others to accept his model of an acceptable balance. It is my contention that since, as Marlowe indicates, we are suggestible, persuasible, and conforming in the presence of others, it should be a conscious part of our interactional patterns to provide opportunities for imitation, attachment, and interdependence worked out within the immediate setting, rather then introducing them as preconceived factors brought to situations by one or more of the partners.[20] I agree with Larsen that the situational structure is all important in human communicative interaction,[21] and with Walker and Heyns that "Conformity and non-conformity are instrumental acts, means to ends, ways of achieving goals to satisfy needs. . .always involving movement or change."[22]

Association with systems which are well known to us, or which we have previously discovered and used within one culture or society, (usually our own), readily can lead us to communicative interactions with others based on apparently logical structures. These may, however, appear quite different to our partners in interaction. To avoid such problems and considering the

bases relating to systems, rules, and the nature of human communication as a culturally shaped survival function, discussed in this paper, a different approach is proposed.

First, I would like to outline the basic problem as I have identified it in my personal experiences as well as in those of many others. One challenge posed by the thought-model proposed here is whether or not it is adequate to consider communication primarily from the standpoints of "conflict—resolution," "argumentation," "confrontation," "rhetoric," "sender-receiver," "communication-equals-agreement" and similar perspectives. These appear to be based more on Western cultural training and observed systems, than the processes we might identify if we broke away from certain traditional systems and categories.

I personally agree with those who indicate that the only real communicative confrontation or interaction which humans can experience has to take place with other individual human beings, even when we associate in groups. My own belief that communicative interaction is the most basic survival mechanism used by human beings, is indicated by the following question:

> Is it possible to identify any human interaction, structure, organization or even culture which is not entirely dependent upon communication for its existence, maintenance, and continuation? (In addition, communication between individuals, in my experience is the only way in which human institutions, including cultures, can be established and maintained.)

Howell represents a common reaction when he speaks of the "workable boundaries to communication," and defines communication as anything one does to influence others.[23] However, I perceive problems with any approach which sees the "use" of communication primarily as an attempt to influence others. I see this approach as <u>one</u>, conscious, aspect of the overall

survival-role which communication plays in human life. It is true that purposeful things are above the threshhold of awareness, lending themselves more readily to analysis and revision, as Howell has indicated. But it appears equally true that these analyses and revisions eventually depend on much deeper and broader underlying human mechanism such as codes, Rules, or biological neurological mechanisms which I have stipulated earlier, because overtly and culturally, identifiable human communication systems are shaped by them.

Some specific approaches to multicultural communication resulting from the thought-model suggested here can now be mentioned. The first major premise I developed earlier, concerns the possibility of studying human communicational processes through the use of models which closely resemble those of biological, metabolic, survival functions, or the neuro-physiological developmental-patterns of the human body.[24] The progressive, individualism within a totally integrated matrix discussed earlier, may lead us to develop a more successful or efficient model for <u>individual</u> communication, and one which may result in a different basis for the development and study of <u>larger communcative structures</u>, matrixes, organizations or institutions, including nations and cultures, because we start with consideration of the individual and his needs. I assume here that any approach to human communication will be strongly, or perhaps entirely, influenced by the underlying philosophy we bring to it. Thus, if we study communication within the framework of repetitive-mechanical, law-governed concepts, we are likely to develop different insights than if we use an open, biological metabolic, fluid, process-oriented approach.

It appears to me to be a significant problem that closed, mechanical systems tend to <u>occupy</u> or <u>take over</u> territory, because by definition they do not interact with their environment as an open system does, resulting in their eventual disintegration. They do not fit in, they do not discover their places, they

occupy any given space. On the other hand, open, metabolic systems, make use of their survival-function or-ability to adapt, through import and export of factors in their environment. Thus they can more readily fit in, become ecological partners, discover their place, with a minimum of disruptive or destructive conquest and confrontation. Models of structures, institutions, organizations, and even cultures from a Western perspective have tended to be mechanical, closed, institutionally-oriented. In the longrun, these models have frequently been control-or dominance-pyramid-shaped models. I have tried to indicate that the use of models based on closed, mechanical systems may create significant problems for human survival because they can stifle the innate, creative, generative mechanism in human beings, as open systems.

I propose, therefore, that we conceive of systems or institutions as extensions of human beings, rather than of human beings as parts of organizations or groups. This thought-model results in the consideration of all institutions as human structures, as reflections of their human component parts, rather than endowing organizations with super-human qualities, often causing us to maintain them at all costs, even if they become destructive of the very beings who develop them. Rather than forcing models (which may be more in line with the maintenance of dominance-oriented-theories or-concepts), on communicative processes, I suggest that we combine the insights of many fields and areas of human study to determine what most adequately can serve human beings as a thought-model or approach to communicative interaction, based on our very nature as biological, metabolic, open systems, and thus serve human survival.

To suit such an approach, a specific procedural framework, or system, is suggested here. Even as two nations may attempt to find a kind of third realm, a kind of neutral meeting place, to provide one basis for the settlement of international conflicts, we may benefit from the development of a similar concept in international and intercultural, or multicultural, communication. Thus we move away from the study of established, identified individual

component parts, or even systems, identified within participating cultures or nations, to a model which focuses on the situational, interactional, communication processes between individuals from various nations, or cultures. I view this process as the conscious establishment of a third or alternative realm, a situational, supportive subculture. I am advocating the conscious development of a multi-cultural systems-construct applicable to specific communicative interaction. It appears to me that this would allow us to see the communication process more readily as something different from, or consisting of more than its original component parts. It becomes something based upon and contributed to by both original and new factor-combinations, a kind of situational sub-culture developed through the interaction of its members. The approach discussed here may prevent us from assuming that we can understand common communicative-process-functions by studying the original, individual culture and national-compound parts of any communication system in their pristine states. It forces us, in each instance, to start with a basically new, situational, systems-model for what may be a significantly different situation, created by the interaction of all contributing parts. It can also prevent the unwarranted and seductive conclusion that we have discovered the underlying rules of the total game, rather than gaining some limited, specific insights.

It is assumed that methodologies or systems used in one culture, including those relating to human communication, do not automatically have comparable meanings in other cultures. The basic change in thought and approach suggested here, would require that in the area of multicultural communication we indicate our awareness of the fact that any communication situation consists of parts of all participating cultures, in turn helping to generate a new or different system. This approach may also provide scholar and communicator alike with a basis for avoiding the temptation of simply falling back into his own, best-known, cultural patterns by forcing him into creating an alternative realm of communication. This generative interaction, in a situation perceived to be essentially new or different, may, rather than requiring the defense of

an existing systems or its defeat, make it possible to overcome the alienation or the threats most individuals experience, when they are forced to submit to what they perceive to be a strange culture (or its representatives), for the sake of getting along, or the sake of communicating. This latter concept frequently is equated with agreement.[25]

The mere existence of the model of this alternative realm, or alternative system, for those participating in the international or intercultural situation does not create a new basis of interaction by itself. I am suggesting, however, that it might allow participants to interact meaningfully because they see themselves as being individually associated in the situational structuring of the actual communication situation. Thus participants can help to develop a common (and meaningful-to-them) system, with a minimum of assumed or real threats resulting from a situation which is perceived as making any one culture or nation the criterion for the human interaction in which participants are engaged.[26]

I stipulated earlier that communication takes place in any situation if there is congnition, and if any kind of meaning is assigned by the participants. It may, however, not result in the cooperative conflict-resolving kind of communication which we tend to consider desirable in Western culture when we use the term communication. Relating this to international and intercultural communication, only when communication becomes a mutually beneficial, not a subversive, destructive, or overpowering situation can we have optimum, positive success as a result of international and intercultural, or multi-cultural interaction. This, obviously, also applies to other types or forms of communication. Already existing cultural patterns, forming part of any communication situation, may very well result in frictions making it impossible to settle disputes, or to accomplish necessary tasks.

What I am suggesting to overcome this problem, is a specific phase in multi-cultural communication which is not dominated by the already existing parts of the situation. Instead it should be marked by

an attempt to make the deep, generative mechanisms of human communication processes function more effectively by allowing creative interaction on all levels. This should result in such an adjustment of human beings as biological, metabolic systems, that a situational territory of mutuality is created which can make later task-orientations more beneficial. Whether this territory provides for deep immersion or a more temporary adjustment should be a feature of the actual process of communication, rather than some arbitrary, or absolute standard which has been predetermined. General-Systems theorists suggest that we should not develop any approach to multicultural communication which is merely based on the understanding of parts, but also on their functions as they interact in the systems, and their functioning in specific situations.[27]

The system suggested here, is based on a definite, initial effort to develop what I have called mutuality within an alternative realm or setting, rather than a jockeying for positions while attempting to persuade others to see our side of the issue. This may make it possible to create less offensive bases for interaction, because we do not start by requiring someone to move to our side, nor do we begin by coercing others in a variety of physical and intellectual ways. Important to such an approach (both in practice and in model- or theory- construction) would also be the willingness of participants to first understand themselves, their own background, needs, or even their lack of awareness or naivete. It requires a kind of growing together in an area or phase that some might describe as neutral, but which I see more as a state of readiness, going beyond that which would be available if we merely mixed already existing and available component parts. What is suggested is that participants need to develop a new, or different communication situation together, by helping their social-communicative-survival metabolism to adjust first. Communication thus is seen not merely as a service-function, or as a superimposed methodology for accomplishing other things, but as an expression of human beings engaged in a mutually beneficial, supportive process.

In a way then the alternative realm, is a conscious, probably limited-in-time creation of a sub-culture for the purpose of accomplishing certain tasks based on communicative interaction. Communication thus becomes a major sub-culture-tool used for fitting into a pattern which somehow has to make sense to individuals in that sub-culture, as it contributes to their feelings of homeostasis. Some of these communicative associations may be deep because they have a great utility. Others can be easily shed, if we see new needs develop. The use of the alternative realm thus takes cognizance of the fact that regardless of what culture or nation an individual belongs to, he still interprets and uses his culture in individual ways. The alternative realm assists in making personal interpretations of culture consonant with other concepts held by other individuals. In the long run, that is always accomplished by using, hiding, or applying what is available according to some internal code or set of rules which makes sense to individual human beings.

Culture is defined here as all common features developed and accepted by individuals for their own purposes as well as common goals, within a given setting. The alternative communication subculture, suggested here forms the basis of my proposed multicultural communication model. Culture is not defined as an idealized concept of absolute sameness or highly developed similarity. Because, whatever similarities are stressed, whatever sameness there is seen in members of the same culture, frequently is only the result of some preconceived concept which has been developed to indicate the unity of some group. Culture can thus become a construct altogether too easily discovered by those who look for it as related to the system-constructs they bring to it.

Culture is a system for structuring the environment and responses to it, for purposes of explanation, understanding, use, control and social interaction by people. As was indicated earlier, culture thus may become an institution, or an institutionalized concept, useful to individuals who are interested in uniting other individuals by using perceived similarities for

their own purposes of control. However, over time human beings tend to preserve those factors which a community of individuals has judged valid to their personal human survival needs. Others are rejected or overturned, because they were not judged to be valid. Since this approach appears to be commonly used by individuals over long periods of time within cultures to optimize their survival chances, the question can be asked: Why not use a similar approach of cultural development, in a very similar way for the purpose of developing the proposed or alternative realm, as a sub-culture for communication in a shorter period of time? I am not suggesting the development of another static state or another limited definition of culture which freezes the underlying concept. Much rather, it appears clear to me that both culture and communication, because of their close relationship, are continually changing, inventing and reinventing, creating and recreating their component parts on the basis of underlying, generative codes and rules, rather than on the surface systems-level discussed earlier. Thus the proposed approach, or thought-model, can become an initial step in our thinking about the area of multi-cultural communication, possibly even of all human communication.

Another basic concept developed in this paper is that it is impossible to find the answers we seek on the basis of any one, culturally-based, systems theory. For instance, it would seem self-evident that we have exhausted the utility of all sender-receiver models, and that we have to look at interpersonal communication as generative, situational interaction. The contact of individuals has to be seen from the standpoint of surface, systematized component parts as well as the underlying codes and rules which are brought to it, making each event unique. What has been stressed here is that communication is a joint venture to which its participants contribute, each at his own level, according to his own perceptions and needs, but all of them making up the total situation. As a result, everything that is done or said by any individual in that situation does modify what others say and do. Having understood that factor, it becomes clear that

deviation from any established or preconceived norm of multi-cultural interaction is a ususal rather than an exceptional thing. Moreover, as a result, normative generalizations cannot be meaningfully applied to all individual instances. In any situation people shape each other's perceptions and thus their overall interaction. Meanings discovered or ascribed are unique to the moment, continuously generated by those who participate in the communicative event. Give-and-take between participants in these situations may finally result in a kind of common ground, or matrix, but understanding depends on internal corrective adjustments of the usual interpretations which a culture or subculture has prepared an individual to discover.

Any instance of multicultural communication would appear to require an intent, a need, or set toward some direction, response, or the seeking of context. If this is not in some part a mutual interactional feature of the communication process, various problems develop. However, if or when such mutuality does exist, we tend to say that effective intercultural and international, or multi-cultural, communication results, and that we are witnessing successful attempts to actively go beyond what would routinely or normally happen within any one culture, or without that mutuality.

Summary:

A major problem in studying international and intercultural, or multi-cultural, communication, arises from the assumption that existing systems, structures, theories, or choices in one (usually our own) culture will produce very similar communicative frameworks or systems in another culture. This idea is often the result of the unproven assumption, that "after all, human beings, underneath it all, are really all the same." In effect, frequently it does not concern itself with individual human beings and their interactions, but rather with the interpretation of systems stipulated by various observers, and dealt wtih as if they were part of the natural order of things. As a result, we often end up on a merry chase with predetermined results. We may become victims of our desire to discover commonality or universality, instead of being comfortable with individuality or variety as a possible basis for human communication. Earlier approaches may very well have guided our thinking to such an extent that we simply look for methodologies and structures which will produce the same meaning in other cultures. What we have referred to as communication thus often requires submission by one or more of the participating cultures (or their representatives) rather than mutuality, which leads to adaptation, understanding, interaction, interdependence, or a feeling of meaningful participation, if not equality, by all.

## FOOTNOTES

[1]Fred L. Casmir, "Integrating Theoretical Constructs in Human Communication," an unpublished paper presented to the Annual Convention of the Communication Association of the Pacific, Kobe, Japan, June, 1976.

[2]Peter R. Monge, "Alternative Theoretical Bases for the Study of Human Communication: The Systems Perspective," a paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, Texas, December, 1975; and Donald P. Cushman, "Alternative Theoretical Bases for the Study of Human Communication: The Rules Perspective," a paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association, Houston, Texas, December, 1975.

[3]Monge, 14.

[4]Monge, 15.

[5]Edward H. Madden, "A Third View of Causality," The Review of Metaphysics, 23 (1969), 67-84.

[6]Ervin E. Laszlo, The Systems View of the World (New York: Braziller, 1972), p. 20. See also, Cushman, 5.

[7]Cushman, 5.

[8]Cushman, 4.

[9]Leigh Marlowe, Social Psychology (Boston: Holbrook Press, Inc., 1975), p. 305.

[10]Edgar H. Schein, "Changing Top Management Values Through Action Research," a paper presented at the 81st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1973. As quoted by Marlowe, p. 306.

[11]Casmir, 19, 20.

[12]Cushman, 6 ff.

[13]Cushman, 14.

[14]Arthur Koestler, The Act of Creation (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1964), pp. 40, 38.

[15]G. E. Coghill, "The Structural Basis of the Integration of Behavior," in: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 16 (1930), 637.

[16]Marlowe, p. 305.

[17]Marlowe, p. 207.

[18]Marlowe, p. 122.

[19]James T. Tedeschi, Barry R. Schlenker, Thomas V. Bonoma, "Cognitive Dissonance: Private Ratiocination or Public Spectacle," American Psychologist, 26 (1971), 8; and Leon Festinger, A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1957).

[20]Marlowe, p. 89.

[21]Knud S. Larsen, Don Coleman, Jim Forbes, Robert Johnson, "Is the Subject's Personality or the Experimental Situation a Better Predictor of a Subject's Willingness to Administer Shock to a Victim?" Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 22 (1972), 3.

[22]Edward L. Walker, Roger W. Heyns, An Anatomy of Conformity (Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole, 1967), p. 5.

[23]William S. Howell is Professor of Speech-Communication at the University of Minnesota. In a series of exchanges in the form of letters and discussions at various national, professional meetings, these ideas were expressed by him.

[24]Coghill. See also Koestler, p. 415 ff.

[25]Consider the discussion of "two-story-culture" in L.Stanley Harms, International Communication (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).

[26]Harms, Chapter 3.

[27]Monge, 4-12.